

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain pending in this application with Claims 1-27 being rejected in the present non-final Office Action.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2, 3, 7, 11, 16, 19, and 24 have been amended to more clearly claim the statutory limitations. Applicants believe that amended independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-24 overcome the above rejection and are now patentable. Withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-9, 16-18, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorna et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,029,172. Jorna et al. describes a computer system that enables a user to browse a hierarchically classified database by interactively displaying a relevant portion of the classification scheme of the database as category names and sub-category names.

The Examiner states that although Jorna et al. does not explicitly disclose the mapping data structure of Claim 1, nevertheless Figure 1 and column 5, lines 3-41 of Jorna et al. makes the invention obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art. This position, however, is not supportable since a perfunctory glance at Figure 1 shows topical groupings and not two or more categories, each of the categories divided into subcategories of **ordered levels** of specificity claimed in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Claim 1 has been amended as described above and in its amended state includes elements not found or implied in Jorna et al. For example, Jorna et al. does not teach or suggest collecting social information at a web site claimed in amended Claim 1.

Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-9, 16-18, and 24, it is submitted that they overcome Jorna et al. by virtue of their dependencies on independent Claim 1.

Claims 25-27 have been amended to include a new limitation of collecting data representing a social category, Jorna et al. does not teach or suggest collecting data representing a social category as claimed in amended Claims 25, 26, and 27.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Claims 1-9, 16-18, and 24-27 are patentable over Jorna et al.

Claims 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorna et al. in view of America Online, Inc. (aol.com). The stated motivation to combine is the status of AOL.com as a well-known Internet Service Provider. Although that statement is true, the status of a web site as a well-known Internet Service Provider is not relevant to the inventive concept of landmark that marks a salient location on one or more of the **districts**. Therefore, combining of AOL.com reference with Jorna et al. is improper and does not render Claim 10 obvious. Moreover, in addition to not teaching or suggesting the limitations of amended Claim 1 as described above, Jorna et al. does not teach or suggest the element of amended Claim 7 of collecting information about one or more nodes located on one or more of **districts** from which Claim 10 and indirectly Claims 11-15 depend.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Claims 10-15 are patentable over Jorna et al. in view of AOL.com.

Claims 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorna et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,493,702 (Adar et al.) Adar et al. describes a search and recommendation system that employs preferences and profiles of individual users and groups within a community of users, as well as information derived from shared document bookmarks, to augment Internet searches, re-rank search results, and provide recommendations for

documents based on a subject-matter query. The Examiner specifically references column 5, lines 38-57 of Adar et al., which states:

“A bookmark system according to the present invention can be implemented as set forth in FIG. 1. The exemplary system includes at least one user 110, and typically a plurality of users 110, 112, 114, and 116. Each user 110-116 is coupled to a document repository 118, such as the Internet (or the World Wide Web), a corporate Intranet, a library, or any other collection of documents. Documents, in this context, refers to any data file containing information readable by a machine or a human; the term includes (but is not limited to) text files, formatted text files, bitmapped image files (including images representing text-based documents), vector-based image files, sound files, multimedia files, and any other data files of possible interest. Documents may be static or dynamically generated based on information in the URL or other request presented to access the document as well as other contextual information, such as the time of day. The repository 118 may be situated on distributed servers such as Web servers on the Internet, a single group of dedicated servers such as a corporate information center, or a single host server.”

Nothing in the cited section or elsewhere in Adar et al. describes collecting information about one or more nodes located on one or more of **districts** claimed in Claim 7 from which Claim 19 directly and Claims 20-23 indirectly depend. Furthermore, Jorna et al., Adar et al., or the combination thereof do not teach or suggest grouping one or more nodes into one or more node sets, each node set containing one or more nodes clustered in nearby locations in one or more of the districts claimed in amended Claim 19 from which Claims 20-22 directly and Claim 23 indirectly depend.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Claims 19-23 are patentable over Jorna et al. in view of Adar et al.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, reconsideration and allowance of amended independent Claims 1 and 25-27 is respectfully requested. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-24, it is submitted that they allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies on independent Claim 1. Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the application, namely Claims 1-27 are believed to be in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
516-228-8484